

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

District of

Delaware

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

V.

Frank Kesting

Defendant

## ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

Case 07-94 SLR

In accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), a detention hearing has been held. I conclude that the following facts require the detention of the defendant pending trial in this case.

## Part I—Findings of Fact


- ☐ (1) The defendant is charged with an offense described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a ☐ federal offense ☐ state or local offense that would have been a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had existed that is
- ☐ a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 3156(a)(4).
- ☐ an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death.
- ☐ an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ a felony that was committed after the defendant had been convicted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state or local offenses.
- ☐ (2) The offense described in finding (1) was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state or local offense.
- ☐ (3) A period of not more than five years has elapsed since the ☐ date of conviction ☐ release of the defendant from imprisonment for the offense described in finding (1).
- ☐ (4) Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of (an) other person(s) and the community. I further find that the defendant has not rebutted this presumption.

## Alternative Findings (A)

- ☐ (1) There is probable cause to believe that the defendant has committed an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c).
- ☐ (2) The defendant has not rebutted the presumption established by finding 1 that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community.

## Alternative Findings (B)

- ☐ (1) There is a serious risk that the defendant will not appear.
- ☐ (2) There is a serious risk that the defendant will endanger the safety of another person or the community.



## Part II—Written Statement of Reasons for Detention

I find that the credible testimony and information submitted at the hearing establishes by clear and convincing evidence a preponderance of the evidence: Defendant was detained because there are no conditions or combination thereof that will reasonable assure his appearance as required and the safety of the community. Defendant is charged with child porn offense<sup>2</sup> for which the rebuttable presumption applies. Defendant has not rebutted that presumption and the evidence against defendant is substantial in support of the offense, which supports the issue of danger to the community.

1. Defendant has an open warrant or capias for failure to appear in JP court.

2. Employed by Clark pools and spas which would require him to go to residences where families reside.

3. Only family information is that defendant and his brother, who was a drug addict, reside together. *His primary lived with aunt.*

4. *Continued relationship to obtain child porn over 10 month period - result is at least 8 charges related to child porn - transmission, production & receipt.*

**Part III—Directions Regarding Detention**

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United States marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

July 17, 2007

Date

  
Signature of Judicial Officer

Mary Pat Thyng, Magistrate Judge

Name and Title of Judicial Officer

\*Insert as applicable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 *et seq.*); (b) Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. § 951 *et seq.*); or (c) Section 1 of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C. § 955a).

RECEIVED  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20535  
JUL 19 2007  
U.S. MARSHAL SERVICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20535  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20535  
U.S. MARSHAL SERVICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20535